

Serial No. 10/578,871

**REMARKS**

The amendments to independent claims 1, 4, and 11 are supported on page 16 of the Specification, lines 3-11, reading,

Besides, as a result of the judgment in the step S44, when the check is performed up to the lowest side key, a presence/absence of the key applicable to the above-stated specific key is sequentially judged from the lowest key among the depressed keys higher than the played key. As a result of this judgment, when the specific key is depressed, it goes to a step S46, and the sound generation process of the resonance is performed.

In response to the outstanding Action:

(1) Claims 12 and 13 are objected to for “if”. This objection is traversed. The Examiner asserts that “it is unclear if the process described is required even when the second/third key is not depressed.” With respect, this is incorrect because claim 1 recites “(a) if no key other than the played key is depressed, performing a normal sound generation process; (b) if any key other than the played key is depressed, performing a strings resonance process”, and the two cases (a) and (b) cover *all possible cases*: namely, no key, and any key. The Examiner is further invited to consider that “if A, then B” is logically equivalent to the statement “if not B, then not A”, which answers the Examiner’s question about whether the process is required even when the second/third key is not depressed.

*Serial No. 10/578,871*

The Examiner returns to this point on page 9, stating, "the term 'if' does not [require] the second key to be depressed." This is correct. However, the Examiner wrongly concludes that "a method ... where a second key is not depressed would read on applicant's claim". The Examiner is giving no weight to the claimed feature, and improperly broadening the claim, on the basis of a logical misapprehension. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider.

(2-3) Claims 1-6 and 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for "the detected difference in pitch". This phrase is changed to "specific relation between a pitch of the played key and a pitch of the already depressed key", as the Examiner suggested, in claims 1, 4, and 11. The Examiner is thanked for suggesting this amendment.

(4-5) Claims 1, 4, and 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Assayag et al., US 5,854,438. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

(a) The reference does not disclose the new feature of claims 1, 4 and 11.

(b) In the second paragraph on page 12, the Examiner attempts to rebut the Applicant's argument by asserting that "the excited G event and the free D event are both produced by pressing the respective keys", because "In order to produce a free note, a key of the keyboard must be pressed with a speed lower than a predetermined speed" which is supported at column 3, lines 4-9. That is, the Examiner is asserting that the "free D" at column 9, line 45 is not a struck key, but merely a release of the key for resonance. However, column 7, lines 14-17 state that "A note is considered free ... no matter what the attack speed," which directly contradicts the passage

*Serial No. 10/578,871*

cited by the Examiner. The Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner cannot rely on column 3, lines 4-9 if column 7, lines 14-17 in the same reference are contradictory.

(c) In the first full paragraph on page 11, the Examiner asserts that Assayag's Fig. 3 contradicts Applicant's argument about a third pitch. However, Fig. 3 shows "harmonics associated with three free notes" (column 8, line 19) and these are therefore played notes, according to the definition at column 7, lines 14-17.

(6-7) Claims 2, 3, 5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Assayag in view of Matsuda et al., US 6,316,711. This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds above. Matsuda also does not disclose the newly-claimed feature.

The Applicant's previous arguments are reiterated by reference. Withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP

*Nick S. Bromer*

Nick S. Bromer  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 33,478

NSB/lrj  
Suite 400  
1420 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 659-2930

23850

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE